

lose when he makes conditions that in no way benefit his country, but bear heavily upon the individual representative of the apologizing country.

The people of Germany are too intelligent to require at the hands of China's representative the humiliation that the "kowtowing" ceremony would impose upon him. Had that ceremony been required, the people of Germany would themselves have been humiliated before the civilized world, and the representatives of civilization would have lost another opportunity of setting a good example to the world's barbarians.

The Star's Inconsistency.

In its issue of September 3, the Kansas City Star took Mr. Bryan to task because of his labor day address. The Star insisted that Mr. Bryan was "looking on the dark side." Among other things that newspaper said:

"Look at the wealth of this country—is the division just?" was one of Mr. Bryan's interrogations. No, it is not just, nor can the distribution of wealth be absolutely just under any form of government and with any race of people. Even the socialistic doctrine, which aims at ideal co-operation, distribution and compensation, cannot possibly insure absolute equity, for some deserve more than others—earn more than others. Such a question answers itself, but the effect of asking it of the poorer class is to engender a feeling among that class against the richer—and that is not in accordance with the democratic spirit of this country, which gives every man a right to acquire and possess.

To say that absolute perfection can not be attained in the distribution of wealth is no defense of a bad law or a bad system. It should be the aim of every good citizen to aid in making the government as nearly perfect as possible. Each person should receive from society in proportion as he contributes to society—this is the ideal condition and should be approached as nearly as human ingenuity can devise. But the purpose of this editorial is not to defend Mr. Bryan but to call attention to the Star's inconsistency.

In its issue of Wednesday, September 4, the Star made admirable answer to itself. Under the headline "Wounds of a Friend," the Star had this to say:

"Faithful are the wounds of a friend," said Solomon, the wise man of old. Under this head may be classed the utterances of Theodore Roosevelt in his address at Minneapolis on Labor Day. Standing out strong and clear among all of the declarations which have been made on the subject of trusts are the following sentiments by the vice president: "We shall find it necessary in the future to shackle cunning, as in the past we have shackled force." * * * "The vast individual and corporate fortunes, the vast combinations of capital which have marked the development of our industrial system create new conditions and necessitate a change from the old attitude of the state and the nation toward property."

These are direct and pointed sentiments inspired by conditions to which no thoughtful and sober minded man can be blind. They are not uttered in any spirit of intemperate agitation or with any purpose to excite false alarm for political purposes. They come from an influential member of the party which capital in modern years has regarded as its chosen champion. They do not proceed from a person who has excited the suspicion of the conservative element by the radical character of his opinions.

In admonishing the large capitalists of their duty Mr. Roosevelt is speaking to persons with whom he has been intimately associated. He is prominently identified with the social and political life of the richest community in America. He is a New Yorker by heredity. He is known and esteemed by the so-called money kings. He could have no possible motive in wishing to overthrow

a fabric which would bring destruction to those who are of the same political household of faith with himself.

Mr. Roosevelt speaks as a friend to the rich men who are rapidly gaining control of the industries and the commerce of the nation. Will it not be infinitely wiser for them to hear him and heed him and follow his counsel than to persist in their scheme of self-aggrandizement at the certain risk of inviting a violent and implacable conflict with avowed enemies, who have none of the regard for the rights of capital which Mr. Roosevelt has always shown?

Why does the Star publish editorials like this which have the effect "to engender a feeling among that class (the workingmen) against the richer?"

If it is wrong for a man who has "excited the suspicion of the conservative element by the radical character of his opinions" to utter the sentiments which Mr. Bryan did at Kansas City, is it not all the more wrong for a "thoughtful and sober minded man" like Mr. Roosevelt to give expression to similar sentiments?

Mr. Roosevelt said that "we shall find it necessary in the future to shackle cunning as in the past we have shackled force." He even went so far as to intimate that it would be necessary to make "a change from the old attitude of the state and the nation toward property;" the very thing which above all others the republican party has insisted is sacred.

When Mr. Bryan said things of this character the Kansas City Star said it was "not in accordance with the democratic spirit of this country which gives every man a right to acquire and possess." But when Mr. Roosevelt said these things this same newspaper cordially commended the speaker and warned "the rich men who are rapidly gaining control of the industries and commerce of the nation" that they will do well to hear and heed and follow the counsel of Theodore Roosevelt.

This same newspaper warns the trust magnates that they will make a mistake if they persist in their "scheme of self-aggrandizement," and that persistence in that direction will be "at the risk of inviting a violent and implacable conflict."

It will be observed that the Star points out that the opinions expressed by Mr. Roosevelt "do not proceed from a person who has caused the suspicion of the conservative element by the radical character of his opinions," and then in the same issue in which the Star commends Mr. Roosevelt's protest against the trusts it in another editorial, says:

William Jennings Bryan, with all his professed hostility for combinations against trade, has never said anything in relation to trusts so emphatic and unequivocal as the utterances of Vice President Roosevelt at Minneapolis. To the notable political epigrams of the day must be added the declaration of Mr. Roosevelt that "we shall find necessary in the future to shackle force." The whole range of modern democratic literature might be searched in vain for a pronouncement more courageous than that on the tyrannical centralization of capital.

So according to the Star's own statement there is more of the "radical character" about Mr. Roosevelt's opinion than attaches to the opinion of Mr. Bryan.

But the question is—of what moment is it who gave utterance to protests against these "schemes of self-aggrandizement"? Of what importance is it whether the protests were uttered by a man like Mr. Bryan, who the Sta

says has "excited the suspicion of the conservative element by the radical character of his opinions", or from Theodore Roosevelt, whom this republican organ is pleased to consider "a thoughtful and sober-minded man"? Is not the question—"Is it the truth?"—the all important one in the contemplation of such a protest?

If conditions warrant such a protest, if the protest is based on justice and truth, is the fact in any wise altered whether the protest is made by Mr. Bryan or by Mr. Roosevelt?

Why is it that, when a democrat enters protest against "self-aggrandizement", this Kansas City paper finds it necessary to argue that such a protest is "not in accordance with the democratic spirit of this country which gives every man a right to acquire and possess"; while when a similar protest is made by a republican this same Kansas City paper on the very following day refers to the latter protest as "direct and pointed sentiments inspired by conditions to which no thoughtful and sober-minded man can be blind"?

If every man has a right to "acquire and possess" regardless of the rights of others, as the Star intimated in its criticism of Mr. Bryan, then with what reason may we object to the schemes of "self-aggrandizement" by which certain rich men are "rapidly gaining control of the industries and the commerce of the nation?"

Is there not danger that by the publication of such editorials as these the Kansas City Star will do things "not in accordance with the democratic spirit of this country which gives every man a right to acquire and possess"?

In all seriousness, can a great newspaper like the Kansas City Star hope that its readers will give serious attention to its opinions when on one day it condemns Mr. Bryan for giving utterance to certain sentiments, and on the next day commends Mr. Roosevelt for giving expression to similar sentiments?

Will they Remember?

Mr. Davis, vice-president of the Amalgamated Association, in a recent speech, charged J. Pierpont Morgan with a fixed determination to destroy all labor organizations. He said:

"The steel men are picked as the first organization to be wiped out. That is why the opposition to us is so bitter, so uncompromising, so regardless of the possibility of arbitration. Next will come the poor old miners, if we are beaten. Then the carpenters and machinists, and after them one trade after another. If we are defeated we shall all become slaves, and we will no longer be worth living."

That the trusts, if permitted to exist, will ultimately destroy the labor unions, is too plain a proposition to admit of dispute, but will the laboring men remember at the polls the lesson they are learning at the door of the factory? The wage-earners have it in their power to destroy every trust and, by so doing, to restore the era of industrial independence, but will they exert that power on election day? No one who understands history or human nature can doubt that private monopolies are a menace to employees, as well as to producers of raw material and to consumers. The time will come when the evils of the trust system will be recognized by all, but in the meantime many bitter lessons are being learned. "Experience is a dear teacher," but apparently the only one whose instruction is heeded.